



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,278	06/27/2001	Marcellino Tanumihardja	360044.403	5239

500 7590 05/26/2005

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 6300
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

WANG, LIANG CHE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/894,278

Applicant(s)

TANUMIHARDJA ET AL.

Examiner

Liang-che Alex Wang

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-99 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-99 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/24/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.
2. Response to restriction is filed on 4/6/2005. Claims 1-17 are elected. Claims 18-99 are withdrawn from consideration.

Paper Submitted

3. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file:
 - a. **Information Disclosure Statements** as received on 9/24/2001 is considered.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Figures 4, 13-16, 24-25 are not readable.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. Abstract is too long.
6. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.
7. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet **within the range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not

exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

8. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-5, 9-13, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith et al., US Patent Number 6,463,462, hereinafter Smith.
11. Referring to claim 1, Smith has taught a method comprising: presenting (figure 19), via a wireless device (Col 4 lines 52-54, the messaging device can be a wireless messaging device), a response aggregation (figure 19) drawn upon a message having at least two desired recipient (abstract lines 1-2; Col 13 lines 48-50, Col 14 line 67 – Col 15 line 2).

12. Referring to claim 2, Smith has further taught wherein said presenting, via a wireless device, a response aggregation drawn upon a message having at least two desired recipients comprises: presenting a desired-recipient response summary (figure 19, Col 7 lines 14-19) having at least one display of aggregate message-related activities (status of recipients in figure 19) of the at least two desired recipients (Col 9 lines 55-62.)
13. Referring to claim 3, Smith has further taught wherein said presenting a desired-recipient response summary having at least one display of aggregate message-related activities of the at least two desired recipients comprises:
 - a. displaying a number of desired recipients who have viewed the message (Figure 19, a list of recipients is shown with the transmitting status as “confirmed”);
 - b. displaying a number of desired recipients who have viewed the message, at least one desired-recipient item selected from a desired-recipient-item group including the at least one desired recipient’s name, the at least one desired recipient’s email address, the message’s title, a date the message was sent, a date the at least one desired recipient viewed the message, and a comment by the at least one desired recipient (Col 9 lines 62-67, the response information displayed can include the identification of the recipients, status and time of the message delivery, substance of the response, identification of the message devices used to deliver the message, time of response, etc.)
14. Referring to claim 4, claim 4 recites the limitation which is similar to claim 3 except the displaying is for the desired recipients who have not viewed the message. Smith has further taught the displaying is also for the desired recipients who have not viewed the

message (see figure 19, the transmitting status shows "sent" but not confirmed, and Col 9 lines 62-67, status and time of the message delivery.)

15. Referring to claim 5, claim 5 recites the limitation, which is similar to claim 3 except the displaying is for the desired recipients whom the message was undeliverable. Smith has further taught the displaying is also for the desired recipients whom the message was undeliverable (Col 7 lines 26-61, user is able to view the verification of message delivery and status of response, and message delivery is either deliverable or undeliverable; Col 9 lines 62-67, status and time of the message delivery.)
16. Referring to claims 9-13, claims 9-13 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-5. Therefore, claims 9-13 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-5.
17. Referring to claim 17, claim 17 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 1-2. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as the claims 1-2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 6-8, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in views of Bookspan et al., US Patent Number 6,636,888, hereinafter Bookspan.

20. Referring to claim 6, Smith has further taught wherein said presenting a desired-recipient response summary having at least one display of aggregate message-related activities of the at least two desired recipients comprises:

displaying a number of desired recipients who have viewed the message (Figure 19, a list of recipients is shown with the transmitting status as "confirmed");

displaying a number of desired recipients who have viewed the message, at least one desired-recipient item selected from a desired-recipient-item group including the at least one desired recipient's name, the at least one desired recipient's email address, the message's title, a date the message was sent, a date the at least one desired recipient viewed the message, and a comment by the at least one desired recipient (Col 9 lines 62-67, the response information displayed can include the identification of the recipients, status and time of the message delivery, substance of the response, identification of the message devices used to deliver the message, time of response, etc.)

Smith has not explicitly taught the displaying is for the desired recipients attending a meeting or event.

However, Bookspan has taught sending desired recipients invitation to an event is one of the basic functions of Microsoft OUTLOOK (Col 14 lines 56-62, Col 17 lines 15-19), and recipients also provided with options to accept or decline the invitation. (Col 14 lines 33-36.)

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the invitation message of Bookspan in Smith such that to have Smith to send invitation messages to recipients and therefore having the

substance of the response of Smith as the decision made from the invitation because both Smith and Bookspan's inventions are working under the environment of Microsoft OUTLOOK (Smith, figure 18; Bookspan Col 14 lines 25-36).

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification to Smith because having the capability to send invitation to desired recipients as taught by Bookspan (Col 14 lines 25-36), would allow the sender to receive feedbacks from the recipients in order to better organizing the event or meeting.

21. Referring to claims 7 and 8, claims 7 and 8 recite the limitation, which are similar to claim 7, except the displaying is for the desired recipients NOT attending a meeting or undecided. Smith as modified has further taught the recipient is offering the options to respond to the invitation (Bookspan Col 14 lines 25-36), and it is clear that there are only three possible response: yes, no or not sure. Therefore claims 7 and 8 is rejected over Smith in view of Bookspan.
22. Referring to claims 14-16, claims 14-16 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claims 6-8. Therefore, claims 14-16 are rejected for the same reason as the claims 6-8

Conclusion


23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by

Art Unit: 2155

the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.
25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Liang-che Alex Wang 
May 18, 2005